arXiv:1408.7075v2 [physics.data-an] 11 Nov 2014

BooNE Technical Note 304

November 12, 2014

FITTING THEORY TO DATA IN THE PRESENCE OF BACKGROUND UNCERTAINTIES

BYRON ROE

Abstract. When fitting theory to data in the presence of background uncertainties, the question of whether the spectral shape of the background happens to be similar to that of the theoretical model of physical interest has not generally been considered previously. These correlations in shape are considered in the present note and found to make important corrections to the calculations. The discussion is phrased in terms of χ^2 fits, but the general considerations apply to any fits. Including these new correlations provides a more powerful test for confidence regions. Fake data studies, as used at present, may not be optimum. Neutrino oscillations are used as examples, but the problems discussed here are general ones.

1. Introduction

When fitting theory to data in the presence of background uncertainties, the question of whether the spectral shape of the background is similar to that of the theoretical model of physical interest has not generally been considered previously. These correlations in shape are considered in the present note and found to make important corrections to the calculations.

Some causal correlations between background and the theoretical model are usually included at present. For example, beam normalization uncertainties affect both the theoretical model and the background. There are also some correlations when the size of the theoretical model affects the size of the background.

However, when the theoretical model parameters are allowed to vary in a fit, there is a new, qualitatively different, correlation that should be considered if the error matrix includes the effects of uncertainties in the backgrounds.

This correlation is not a causal correlation, but occurs simply due to a similarity between the spectrum of the theoretical model over the bins and the spectrum of the backgrounds. This similarity can be quantified using a regression analysis. These correlations should, perhaps, be distinguished by being called "regression correlations".

Including these new correlations provides a more powerful test for confidence regions. Use of Monte Carlo simulations to estimate confidence regions ("fake data studies") as described in Section 6 give valid confidence regions with or without the corrections described here. However, the use of these correlations allows a more powerful test, often giving smaller regions for a given confidence level. This effect will be illustrated in the numerical example studied in Section 7.

A chisquare fit will often not have chisquare distribution with or without the corrections here. The problem, which is well, but sometimes not widely known, is that systematic background errors are really different than the statistical errors. If an experiment is repeated, the numbers of events are different each time because of the statistical errors. However, the background expectation is the same each time. Nature has chosen some value. The systematic error here is the uncertainty in our knowledge of what is that value, a Bayesian concept which does not fit comfortably in the frequentist χ^2 method. When this systematic effect is included in the error matrix as if it were a statistical error, a chisquare probability may not result. This point will also be illustrated in the numerical example in Section 7.

The toy model considered in Section 3 describes the essence of the problem considered in this note.

2. Notation

Suppose data have been obtained for a histogram with N_{bins}. The ith bin has $N_{data}(i)$ events. The model used for fitting the data has background parameters and theory parameters.

Let $B_j(i)$ be the true expected value of background j in bin i. Let N_{bkrd} be the number of background parameters associated with these backgrounds. For any given data set, the number of background events will have a statistical spread with mean value $B_j(i)$. It is assumed that the backgrounds have been evaluated in independent experiments previously, giving estimates for the mean value of each $(B_m)_j(i)$ and the covariance matrix of the error in the estimated mean value $cov_{(B_m)_j}$. There are correlations from bin to bin and also correlations between the various backgrounds, so that the covariance matrix is not, in general, diagonal. The total estimated background expectation is $(B_m)_{tot}(i)$.

For the initial discussion, it is assumed that there are a string of separate backgrounds, each with one parameter; the total background is then

$$(B_m)_{tot}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{bkrd}} (B_m)_j(i). \tag{1}$$

Each background has the form $B_j(i) = b_j g_j(i)$, where $i = 1, \cdots, N_{bins}$, and $j = 1, \cdots, N_{bkrd}$. The b_j correspond to scale parameters defining the level of background. The bin dependence of each of the backgrounds $g_j(i)$ is assumed known and fixed. In Section 5, the form of the backgrounds will be generalized.

The second kind of parameters are parameters of the theoretical model of physical interest and are initially unknown. There are N_t theory parameters, $t_k,\ k = 1, \cdots, N_t$. The theory model prediction for each bin, $N_{th}(i)$, is a function of these parameters.

Define the "signal" as the data minus the background estimates. This is the part of the data that will be fitted to the theoretical model of interest.

$$N_{sig}(i) \equiv N_{data}(i) - (B_m)_{tot}(i). \tag{2}$$

Two common χ^2 fitting methods are considered. For the first fitting method, the parameters assigned to the background(s) are held fixed in the fit at their measured values. The uncertainty in the background parameters enters into the covariance used in the fit. The covariance matrix of the signal in bins i, j is given as

$$cov_{sig}(i,j) = cov_{data}(i,j) + cov_{(B_m)_{tot}}(i,j). \tag{3}$$

$cov_{data}(i,j)$ is diagonal and is the variance expected for the data in each bin given the theory plus background prediction for the mean number of events in that bin.

The fit done is to minimize the χ^2,

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N_{bins}} [N_{sig}(i) - N_{th}(i)][cov^{-1}_{sig}(i,j)][N_{sig}(j) - N_{th}(j)], \tag{4}$$

where $[cov^{-1}_{sig}(i,j)]$ is the inverse of the signal covariance matrix.

A second approach uses a constrained fit to account for backgrounds, constraining the backgrounds to be at their measured values within errors, when performing fits. The χ^2 is written as a χ^2 ignoring the background uncertainties and a sum of terms ("pulls") for each background. For simplicity, assume for the initial discussion that there are no correlations between backgrounds and that each background depends on a single variable. Let $\beta_k(i) = \frac{\partial(B_{tot}(i)+N_{th}(i))}{\partial\delta_k}|_{\delta_k=0}$, where δ_k is the deviation of the true kth background or nuisance parameter from its measured value. The set of b_k parameters is usually enlarged for this fit method to include nuisance parameters which can affect both the theory and the backgrounds, such as the overall normalization of the data. However, in this note the δ_k will refer only to the background parameters. The experimental quantities are $N_{data}(i)$ and $(B_m)_k(i)$, the latter obtained from previous experiments. $\beta_k(i)$ is a fixed quantity obtained from the spectrum of the backgrounds. (For the initial assumption that $g_k(i)$ is known, $\beta_k(i) = g_k(i)$.)

N_{th} and the δ_k are quantities to be fitted. Let $\sigma^2_{b_k}$ be the variance of the estimate of background parameter b_k.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} \frac{\left[N_{data}(i) - \left(N_{th}(i) + \sum_k((B_m)_k(i) + \beta_k(i)\delta_k)\right)\right]^2}{\sigma^2_{data}(i)} + \sum_k \frac{\delta_k^2}{\sigma^2_{b_k}}. \tag{5}$$

In the presence of correlations between backgrounds, the usual introduction of the covariance matrix is used. Since each pull term introduces an effective extra bin and an extra parameter to be fit, the number of degrees of freedom is unaffected. If one performs Gaussian integration in Equation 5 over the δ_k, this approach reduces to the previous one [1].

As indicated in the introduction, the uncertainty in the background is the uncertainty in our knowledge of that value, a Bayesian concept. The constrained fit treats the background expectation value as another parameter to be fitted along with the theoretical parameters.

χ^2 fits are often done in an iterative fashion taking one step at a time looking for the minimum. The correlations are re-evaluated at each step.

3. A toy model

Suppose one is fitting a theoretical model parameter to data, where the theoretical model is of the form $N_{th}(i) = tf(i)$, where t is a constant to be fit and $f(i)$ is a known function of the bin number i. Suppose, further, that there is a single background which is uncorrelated with the model parameter. $B(i) = bg(i)$ with $g(i)$ known. Let b_m be the estimated mean of b and $\sigma^2_{b_m}$ be the estimated variance of b_m. The fit is done by using the method of Equations 3 and 4. The covariance of the background is $cov_{B_m}(i,j) = g(i)g(j)\sigma^2_{b_m}$. The overall covariance, $cov_{overall}$, is the sum of the statistical variance of the data, σ^2_{data} and the covariance of the background, $cov_{overall}(i,j) = \sigma^2_{data}(i)\delta_{ij} + cov_{B_m}(i,j)$.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} [N_{data}(i) - b_m g(i) - tf(i)] cov^{-1}_{overall}(i,j) [N_{data}(j) - b_m g(j) - tf(j)], \tag{6}$$

where $cov^{-1}_{overall}(i,j)$ is the inverse of the covariance matrix. Let t_0 be the result of that fit. The uncertainty is assigned to the t parameter by the usual $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2_{th(t)} - \chi^2_{\text{best fit}}$ method.

Now suppose that the background has the form $bf(i)$, where b is a constant and $f(i)$ is the same known function that appeared for the theoretical model parameter. The model and background are now completely correlated, that is, they have the same shape as a function of bin number and differ only in normalization. The minimum χ^2 is then independent of whatever value had been estimated for b_m, since if b_m is changed, the fitted value of t will change to compensate, because $f(i)$ is a common factor for theoretical model and background.

Now write the square bracketed terms in the numerator for the χ^2 fit, using b not b_m, as $[N_{data}(i) - (t+b)f(i)] = [N_{data}(i) - zf(i)]$, where $z \equiv t + b$. The background experiment has previously obtained an estimated mean and uncertainty for the parameter b. The fit here obtains a mean and uncertainty for the parameter $z = t + b$.

Assume, incorrectly, that the error matrix remains the same as for the uncorrelated fit. If b is estimated by (b_m), the new fit for t is the same as the old one, $t_{fit} = t_0$.

However, the covariance matrix is not the same as it was for the previous fit. For this new fit using z, the background is part of the parameter z being fitted. There is no mention of b; only z appears in the fit. The z fit can be done perfectly well if there is no prior knowledge of b. The $cov_{B_m}(i,j)$ is not included in the error matrix of the χ^2 terms.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} \frac{[N_{data}(i) - zf(i)]^2}{\sigma^2_{data}}. \tag{7}$$

Compare the two results. If the fit has gone to the same place, both fits will get t_0. For the z fit, $t = z - b_m$. The uncertainty in t will be essentially the same for both methods. For the t fit, the uncertainty in the background appears in the $cov^{-1}_{B_m}(i,j)$ term in the χ^2

formula, which broadens the shape of the χ^2 around the minimum value. For the z fit the uncertainty in t due to b comes explicitly. In $t = z - b_m$, the uncertainty in z comes from the χ^2 fit and the uncertainty in b comes from the uncertainty in the measured value of b_m The difference between the t fit and the z fit comes in the value of χ^2 obtained at the minimum, the probability of the fit. For the t fit, even though the minimum point for χ^2 is independent of the value of b_m, the χ^2 probability of the fit depends on $cov_{B_m}(i,j)$. The z fit gives a sharper measure of the fit probability. The z fit asks whether the data can be fit by an $f(i)$ form, regardless of whether it is background or signal. For the t fit, if the background error is sufficiently large, a good fit can be obtained even when the form of the data differs very considerably from $f(i)$.

This problem is seen more clearly using the constrained fit method of Section 2, the "pulls" method fit.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} \frac{[N_{data}(i) - (t + b_m + \delta_b)f(i)]^2}{\sigma^2_{data}(i)} + \frac{\delta_b^2}{\sigma_b^2}, \tag{8}$$

since $\beta(i) = f(i)$ here. If there is complete correlation, the pull term will become zero in the fit, regardless of the size of the actual δ_b. Any difference between b and the estimated b_m will be taken up by changing t and leaving δ_b zero. This means that, effectively, one bin has been lost and the number of degrees of freedom is reduced by one. The probability obtained using the nominal degrees of freedom is then too high, just as seen for the first fitting method.

The odd results with both of the t, b fits have the same root cause, which is seen most easily in the constrained fit method. The problem is that t and b are correlated parameters in the fit appearing only as $t + b$; z is the only fitting parameter. The fitting methods discussed in Section 2 allow correlations between background parameters. The constrained fit method even, as mentioned in Section 2, allows causal correlations between background and signal parameters such as occur in overall normalization of the data. However, it cannot handle a non-causal accidental correlation between a background parameter and a theory parameter due solely to a similarity between the shape of the background and theory functions over the histogram bins, *i.e.,* by a regression correlation. Fitting t and b without accounting for this correlation produces a result that is not powerful as the one obtained when correlations are included. The fit with z avoids this problem. The z fit is a straightforward χ^2 fit with the usual χ^2 properties. As indicated above, the fit determines the estimate for $z = t + b$ and the uncertainties of that estimate, while the preliminary background experiment has obtained the same quantities for b. It is then completely straightforward to combine the two measurements to get an estimate for the value of t and the uncertainties of that estimate.

The subtlety here is that both t and b are involved in the fit. If a fixed value of t is used and there is no fit, the question of correlation between t and b does not enter and, for the first method, the χ^2 distribution should include $cov_{B_m}(i,j)$.

The same correlation correction applies for the likelihood method. For this discussion, as a shorthand, t, b, and z are taken to be the random variables for these parameters. The

variables can be changed from t, b to the independent variables z, b with a Jacobian of one. Then the probability of the b term can be integrated out and, as with the χ^2 fits, only $\mathcal{L}(data|z)$ remains

$$\mathcal{L}(data|t,b)\mathcal{L}(b) = \mathcal{L}(data|t+b)\mathcal{L}(b) = \mathcal{L}(data|z)\mathcal{L}(b),$$
$$\int \mathcal{L}(data|z)\mathcal{L}(b)db = \mathcal{L}(data|z).$$

Another method to treat the correlation problem would be to make a combined fit for the background and the model parameters using the combined histograms for both the present experiment and the background experiments. However, if there are many backgrounds, often determined by varied methods, the "curse of dimensionality" makes this impractical.

Consider the neutrino oscillation fit, used in MiniBooNE. In this experiment a beam of muon neutrinos is produced and sent to a detector. In the flight from production to interaction in the detector some muon neutrinos may have changed into electron neutrinos. The experiment looks for these electron neutrinos, and tries to determine the number of electron neutrinos obtained and their energy spectrum. The theoretical model for this process (assuming only ν_e and ν_μ neutrinos) involves the product (not sum) of two parameters, one a function of Δm^2 and the other is $\sin^2 2\theta$. Δm^2 determines the shape of the energy spectrum and $\sin^2 2\theta$ is a scale parameter determining the size of the effect. A major background comes from muon neutrino interactions in the detector producing π^0, which decay into two photons and may make the event appear to be an electron neutrino event. For the MiniBooNE experiment, does the π^0 background resemble the results expected from the theoretical model? π^0 background numbers for the neutrino exposure are obtained from Table 6.5 of the MiniBooNE Technical Note 194 [2]. The neutrino spectrum and the neutrino quasi-elastic cross sections were read from Figures 2 and 5 from a MiniBooNE neutrino elastic scattering Physical Review article [3]. Results are shown in Figure 1. For $\Delta m^2 = 2$ or 1 eV^2, the mean and σ of the π^0 background and the theoretical expectations are quite close and the correlations are large.

4. Partial correlations

In practice, regression correlations are almost never complete; it is necessary to consider partial correlations between the theoretical model and background. In this section a simple model will be considered. The model then will be generalized in the following section. The theory model here will be taken as $N_{th}(i) = tf(i)$, where $f(i)$ is a known function and t is the fitting variable. There may be several backgrounds, but it is assumed here that only background B_k has a significant correlation with the theoretical model shape. The background is taken as $B_k = b_k g_k(i)$, where $g_k(i)$ is a known function and b_k was measured in a previous experiment with some uncertainty. Let M_f and σ_f be the mean value and spread over the histogram bins for $f(i)$ and M_{g_k} and σ_{g_k} be the mean value and spread of $g_k(i)$. The means and σ's here refer to mean values and spreads over the bins of the histogram. They do not refer to measurement uncertainties. Let $f'(i) \equiv f(i) - M_f$ and $g'_k(i) \equiv g_k(i) - M_{g_k}$.



FIGURE 1. The top figure shows the energy spectrum expected for the π^0 background. The horizontal axis is the energy in GeV obtained if the π^0 events are mistakenly reconstructed as charged current quasi-elastic electron neutrino events. The dashed green line is the part of the π^0 background that is correlated with the theory if $\Delta m^2 = 0.76$ ev^2. The dotted blue line is the part of the π^0 background that is correlated with the theory if $\Delta m^2 = 0.42$ ev^2. The middle figure shows the energy spectrum expected for the neutrino oscillation signal if $\Delta m^2 = 0.76$ eV^2. The correlation with the π^0 spectrum is 0.415. The bottom figure shows the energy spectrum expected for the neutrino oscillation signal if $\Delta m^2 = 0.42$ eV^2. The correlation with the π^0 spectrum is 0.587.

Start by considering the regression correlation between $g'_k(i)$ and $f'(i)$. Consider a plot of the background $g'_k(i)$ (y-axis) versus the theoretical model $f'(i)$ (x-axis), where the points are the values for each bin. A straight line regression fit of background on theoretical model is made. Let $x^*_{\rm temp}(i) = af'(i)$, where a is a constant chosen to minimize $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}}[g'_k(i) - x^*_{\rm temp}(i)]^2$. The line $x^*_{\rm temp}(i)$ represents the completely correlated part of $g'(i)$ in this linear approximation. The result is

$$\frac{x^*_{\rm temp}(i)}{\sigma_{g_k}} = \rho\frac{f'(i)}{\sigma_f}, \tag{9}$$

where the regression correlation coefficient is given by

$$\rho = \frac{\frac{1}{N_{bins}}\sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} g'_k(i)f'(i)}{\sigma_{g_k}\sigma_f}, \tag{10}$$

and

$$\sigma_f = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{bins}}\sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}}(f'(i))^2}. \tag{11}$$

σ_{g_k} is obtained similarly. This result is derived in [4] and is discussed in [5].

As seen in Equation 9, this straight line fit $x^*_{\rm temp}$ is linearly related to the theoretical model bin dependence $f'(i)$. For a given theoretical model there is no uncertainty in the values of M_f and σ_f. With the present assumption that $g(i)$ is a known function, there is no uncertainty in the values of ρ, M_{g_k} and the value of σ_{g_k}. Note that Equations 9 and 10 are normalization independent because of the divisions by σ.

$$x^*_{\rm temp}(i) = \frac{\rho\sigma_{g_k}}{\sigma_f}f'(i) = \rho_{eff}f'(i), \tag{12}$$

where $\rho_{eff} \equiv \rho\sigma_{g_k}/\sigma_f$ is defined as the "effective" correlation coefficient.

$x^*_{\rm temp}(i)$ is appropriate for f', g' not for the full f, g which include the mean values. It does not approach the appropriate limit for full correlation for f, g. It is necessary to translate along the f' axis. The size of the translation is uniquely set by asking that, including mean values, appropriate results are obtained for $\rho = 0$ and $\rho = 1$. The proper translation is to plot the points at $f' + \rho_{eff}M_f$. The translated x^* is then

$$x^*(i) = x^*_{\rm temp}(i) + \rho_{eff}M_f = \rho_{eff}f'(i) + \rho_{eff}M_f = \rho_{eff}f(i). \tag{13}$$

Since $x^*(i)$ is proportional to $f(i)$, the regression correlation of x^* with f is one. It can easily be shown that the regression correlation of the residuals, $g(i) - x^*(i)$ is zero. $b_kx^*(i)$ can be considered to be the correlated part of the full background k and the distances $b_k[g_k(i) - x^*(i)]$ will be taken to represent the uncorrelated part of the background. This division will be assumed to give a reasonable first order division of the backgrounds. Let $\Delta_k(i)$ be the uncorrelated part of background k.

$$\Delta_k(i) = b_k[g_k(i) - x^*(i)] = b_k\big([g'_k(i) - \rho_{eff}f'(i)] + [M_g - \rho_{eff}M_f]\big). \tag{14}$$

$\Delta_k(i)$ does go to appropriate limits for $\rho = 0$ and $\rho = 1$. If $\rho = 0$, then $\Delta_k(i) = b_k g_k(i)$ as expected. For $\rho = 1$, then $g'(i)$ is proportional to $f'(i)$, and $\rho_{eff} = 1 \times (\sigma_{g_k}/\sigma_f)$ is the constant of proportionality. $\Delta_k(i) = b_k[M_g - (\sigma_{g_k}/\sigma_f)M_f]$. For the toy model considered in the previous section, $g(i) = f(i)$, the means are the same, $\sigma_{g_k}/\sigma_f = 1$ and $\Delta_k(i) = 0$, as expected. If the toy model is extended to be $g(i) = f(i) + C$, where C is a constant, then the above expression is again correct.

Note that it can turn out that $\rho < 0$. It still will be the proper value to minimize the sum of the squares of the distances of the background from x^*. Depending on the mean values M_f and M_g, the correlated part of background k can have some bins with a value more than the experimental background points. This should be expected. Even if the means were the same, when the fit to the correlated straight line is made, some background points will be above and some below that line. This is not generally a problem for the method as $b_k x^*(i) + \Delta_k(i)$ must equal the entire background $B_k(i)$.

The covariance matrix of Δ_k due to the uncertainty in the experimental values obtained for background from the experiments determining the background is given by:

$$cov_{\Delta_k}(i,j) = [g_k(i) - \rho_{eff} f(i)][g_k(j) - \rho_{eff} f(j)]\sigma^2_{b_k}. \tag{15}$$

The fitting function is:

$$N_{fit}(i) = tf(i) + b_k x^*(i) = zf(i), \tag{16}$$

where $z = t + b_k \rho_{eff}$.

N_{sig} in Section 2 had subtracted from data the estimates of all background. $N_{sig-corr}$ adds to N_{sig} the estimate of the correlated part of B_k. The total background, $B_{tot}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{bkrd}}[B_j(i)]$, should now not include all of $B_k(i)$, but should include only the uncorrelated part of it.

$$N_{sig-corr}(i) = N_{data}(i) - \sum_{j \neq k}(B_m)_j(i) - \Delta_k(i). \tag{17}$$

$$cov_{corr}(i,j) = cov_{data}(i,j) + cov_{(\Delta_k + \sum_{j \neq k} B_j)}(i,j). \tag{18}$$

For the first fitting method in Section 2

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N_{bins}} [N_{sig-corr}(i) - zf(i)][cov^{-1}_{corr}(i,j)][N_{sig-corr}(j) - zf(j)]. \tag{19}$$

Because the square bracket terms in the χ^2 still add up to data minus the sum of theory plus background, the only change in the χ^2 calculation due to regression correlations comes in the covariance for this method.

For the constrained fit method, $\beta_\ell(i) = \frac{\partial[\Delta_k(i) + \sum_{j \neq k}(B_m)_j(i)]}{\partial \delta_{b_\ell}}|_{\delta_{b_\ell}=0}$, where δ_{b_ℓ} is the deviation of background parameter b_ℓ from its measured value. Only the uncorrelated part of the background is used in calculating $\beta_\ell(i)$. For background k, $\beta_k(i) = g_k(i) - \rho_{eff} f(i)$.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} \frac{[N_{sig-corr}(i) - zf(i) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_{bkrd}} \beta_\ell(i)\delta_\ell]^2}{\sigma^2_{data}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_{bkrd}} \frac{\delta^2_{b_\ell}}{\sigma^2_{b_\ell}}. \tag{20}$$

After the fit the estimate for t is found from

$$t_{fit} = z_{fit} - \rho_{eff} b_k, \tag{21}$$

where, for the first method $(b_m)_k$ is used and for the constrained fit method the fitted value of b_k is used. If the fit was made using t and b, but with the reduced $\Delta_k(i)$, then the value of t is directly obtained in the fit. The covariance of t is given by

$$cov_t = cov_{z_{fit}} + cov_{\rho_{eff} b_k}. \tag{22}$$

5. Generalization of the model

The correlations considered in the last section can vary with the values of the theoretical model parameters. The object of the fit is to minimize χ^2 given the correlations relevant to the fit point. This means that the correlations must be adjusted to follow the fitting. Often the fitting of complex data is done by successive approximations, such as occur in the popular CERN program Minuit [6]. Sometimes, the fitting is just done by calculating χ^2 at points along an N_t dimensional lattice. However the fit is done, at each step or point, the correlations must be recalculated given the model parameters at that step or point.

The assumptions in the last section that the theory could be represented by $tf(i)$ and the background k by $b_k g_k(i)$ with $f(i)$ and $g_k(i)$ known functions were taken to simplify the initial discussion. Often, theory and background have more general functions. Furthermore, most problems do not have a single correlated background parameter and often have more than one theoretical fitting parameter. It is necessary to include the effects of multiple backgrounds and multiple theoretical fitting parameters. Redo the regression analysis of the last section, using the full theoretical model and the total background instead of f and g. Let $M_{B_{tot}}$ and M_{th} be the means over the bins of the total background (B_{tot}) and the total theory model (N_{th}). The σ's are defined in an analogous manner. Let:

$$B'_{tot}(i) = B_{tot}(i) - M_{B_{tot}};\ N'_{th}(i) = N_{th}(i) - M_{th}. \tag{23}$$

Equation 13 becomes:

$$\frac{x^*(i)}{\sigma_{B_{tot}}} = \rho \frac{N_{th}(i)}{\sigma_{th}}. \tag{24}$$

$$\rho = \frac{\frac{1}{N_{bins}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} B'_{tot}(i) N'_{th}(i)}{\sigma_{B_{tot}} \sigma_{th}}. \tag{25}$$

Define $\rho_{eff} \equiv \rho \sigma_{B_{tot}} / \sigma_{th}$.

$$x^*(i) = \rho_{eff} N_{th}(i). \tag{26}$$

For independent backgrounds, $x^*(i)$, defined above, is just the sum of the $x^*_k(i)$ for the individual backgrounds $B_k(i)$. The uncorrelated part of the background is

$$\Delta(i) = B_{tot}(i) - x^*(i) = B_{tot}(i) - \rho_{eff} N_{th}(i). \tag{27}$$

$$N_{sig-corr}(i) = N_{data}(i) - \Delta(i). \tag{28}$$

$$cov_{corr}(i,j) = cov_{data}(i,j) + cov_{\Delta}(i,j). \tag{29}$$

If the only uncertainty in the background is the overall normalization b of the total background, then $cov_{\Delta}(i,j)$ is particularly simple. For a normalization change, $B_{tot}(i)$, $M_{B_{tot}}$, and ρ_{eff} are all proportional to the normalization b. ρ_{eff} is proportional because of the $\sigma_{B_{tot}}$ in the definition. Therefore $\delta(\Delta(i)) = (\delta b/b)\Delta(i)$, leading to $cov_{\Delta}(i,j) = \Delta(i)\Delta(j)\sigma_b^2/b^2$. If there are a sum of independent backgrounds, each of which has only a normalization uncertainty, one can use a simple generalization of this calculation since, as was noted above, one can just use the sum of the individual backgrounds for x^*.

Remembering that the bin dependence of $x^*(i)$ is proportional to that of $N_{th}(i)$ the fitting function can be written

$$N_{fit}(i) = N_{th}(i|\vec{t}\,) + x^*(i) = N_{th}(i|\vec{t}\,)(1+\rho_{eff}), \tag{30}$$

where $N_{th}(i|\vec{t}\,) = N_{th}(i|t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_{N_t})$ is the prediction for the mean number of theory model events in bin i, given the values of the theoretical parameters $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_{N_t}$. The fitting function should now be viewed as N_{fit}, not just N_{th}. In the last section the theory and background parameters were simple scaling functions. The regression correlation considered $f'(i)$ and $g'_k(i)$ which were independent of the scaling. ρ_{eff} and M_g were not functions of the parameters. The parameters t and b_k appeared explicitly in Δ and N_{fit}. This simple separation cannot be assumed for the general problem considered here and the regression correlation was calculated using the full theory and full background. The effect of background parameters and their uncertainties now appears in N_{fit} through ρ_{eff}. (If in the last section, the regression had been done with tf and bg instead of f and g, then, because $\sigma_{bg} = b\sigma_g$, ρ_{eff} would have been proportional to b.) The χ^2 uncertainty obtained from $\Delta\chi^2$ refers to the uncertainty in N_{fit}. The uncertainties in N_{th} are obtained by appropriately convoluting the uncertainties coming from the χ^2 and the background uncertainties. This is the generalization of Equation 22.

For the first fitting method discussed in Section 2,

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N_{bins}} [N_{sig-corr}(i) - N_{th}(i|\vec{t}\,)(1+\rho_{eff})]$$
$$[cov^{-1}_{corr}(i,j)][N_{sig-corr}(j) - N_{th}(j|\vec{t}\,)(1+\rho_{eff})]. \tag{31}$$

If the constrained fit method is used, assume there are N_{bkrd} background parameters, b_k, $k = 1, \cdots, N_{bkrd}$. Let $\beta_k(i) = \frac{\partial\Delta(i)}{\partial\delta_k}|_{\delta_k=0}$, where δ_k is the deviation of background parameter b_k from its measured value. As in the previous section, only the uncorrelated

background is used to find $\beta_k(i)$.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} \frac{[N_{sig-corr}(i) - N_{th}(i|\vec{t}\,)(1+\rho_{eff}) - \sum_{k=1}^{N_{bkrd}} \beta_k(i)\delta_k]^2}{\sigma^2_{data}} + \sum_{k,\ell=1}^{N_{bkrd}} \delta_k[cov^{-1}(k,\ell)]\delta_\ell, \tag{32}$$

where $[cov^{-1}(k,\ell)]$ is the inverse of the covariance matrix between δ_k and δ_ℓ.

6. Incorporating these correlations in practice

It was noted in Section 3, that the fits for neutrino oscillation in the MiniBooNE experiment are not simple sums. In terms of the notation from Section 4, for $tf(i)$, t is determined by $\sin^2 2\theta$ and $f(i)$ by a function of Δm^2. The two parameters work together to produce a single spectrum. For a background which matches the shape for a given Δm^2, any mis-estimate of the scale of the background will appear in the fitted value of $\sin^2 2\theta$ and the correlated part of the background should be associated with that parameter.

The individual terms in the sum of model terms will sometimes be these composite terms. This occurs, for example in fits of neutrino data for sterile neutrino hypotheses. There will sometimes also be more complicated dependences than the simple ones here and it is necessary to examine the situation for each particular experiment as indicated in the last section.

For determining confidence regions, consider a theoretical model point A. If the absolute χ^2 is to be used and A is a fixed point, not the result of a fit, then the regression correlations should not be included in the calculation of probability. If there is a fit, regression correlations should be used. The $\Delta\chi^2$ method, ($\Delta\chi^2 \equiv \chi^2_A - \chi^2_{\text{best fit}}$) is a test often used to determine confidence regions. The χ^2 at A using the regression correlations at A minus the best fit χ^2 using the regression correlations at the best fit should then be used. It is important to note that the χ^2 returns the probability of N_{fit}.

To find a confidence region for the theoretical parameters, the set of t's, it is, in principle, necessary to convolute the χ^2 probability with the probability for the background uncertainties. See the discussion following Equation 30. If the fit explicitly included the theory and background, and only modified the covariance for the correlations, then the theory parameters for the minimum are already the appropriate ones, for the first χ^2 method discussed in Section 2. However, for the constrained fit method the change in background value must be taken into account. Calculation of this change will be discussed in the next section.

For fake data studies the experiment is replicated a number of times with Monte Carlo events. The theoretical model is held fixed, However, for each repetition, the backgrounds are varied randomly within their uncertainties. These studies are useful for estimating the expected variance of the result, for examining the effects of individual backgrounds, and for examining the sensitivity to the values of the uncertainties of these backgrounds. They

are widely used, because they do not depend on knowing the form of psudo-χ^2 probability distributions in advance.

They give valid confidence level regions for any valid test. However, the use of regression correlations makes the test more powerful as will be seen in the numerical example in Section 7. Consider an analogy. Suppose one estimates the distance between two objects on a somewhat blurry image, obtaining an estimated distance and the uncertainty of that estimate. If a better focussed image is available, a new estimate can be made. Both estimates are correct given the images each has used, but the estimate from the more focussed image can be considered a more optimum estimate.

In the presence of the correlations discussed in this note, there is no change to the usual procedure for choosing Monte Carlo events. The regression correlations do not enter and only the usual backgrounds are randomly varied.

What happens next depends upon the question asked. Suppose there is no fit and the question asked is, "What is the distribution of χ^2 if the model parameters are fixed?" For this question, the regression correlations do not enter.

However, suppose there is a fit, and it is desired to find the probability that a specific theoretical model A would give at least as high a χ^2 as obtained in the real data. A number of fake data samples are generated for model A and, for each, the χ^2 for A and the χ^2 values for the best fit are found using the regression correlations. Then, if the $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2(A) - \chi^2(\text{best fit})$ method is used, the likelihood of that model is estimated by the fraction of times that the Monte Carlo $\Delta\chi^2$ is greater or equal to the $\Delta\chi^2$ value obtained for the data. If an absolute χ^2 method is used, then the likelihood is the fraction of time that the Monte Carlo result is larger than the data χ^2. If the model and background correlations vary with the model point and the regression correlations are ignored, the best fit point may be different.

At present, the use of an "effective number of degrees of freedom" is frequently employed to give corrections to the nominal number. The effective number of degrees of freedom is found by fitting the χ^2 curve found from fake data studies. As noted in Section 3, the presence of systematic background uncertainties, means that, with or without these corrections, the probability distribution may not have a χ^2 shape. With this new procedure the effective number should be closer to the real number, because the size of the background uncertainty included in the error matrix is reduced. It is still be useful to include the new effective number as a residual correction.

7. An example calculation

The example taken here is a simplified version of the neutrino oscillation search in the MiniBooNE experiment. No MiniBooNE data were used. π^0 events are a very major background to the search for ν_e events. In this example it is taken as the only backround. The expected background (π^0-events) were taken from [2]. The background uncertainty was taken as a simple scale factor of 15% for the expected number of π^0 background events in each bin. The number of data events was taken to be approximately the same as the number of events in the MiniBooNE ν run [3]. Eight bins of energy were used. The energy

Bin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
E	250.0	350.0	450.0	550.0	700.0	900.0	1250.0	1650.0
S	34.0	58.3	54.9	50.9	37.6	21.5	7.8	1.1
B	67.8	62.4	57.7	47.8	31.2	15.3	7.5	3.5

TABLE 1. For each energy bin, the mean energy used E (MeV), the expectation value for the number of signal (S) events for the data set, $\Delta m^2 = 0.42$ eV^2, $\sin^2 2\theta = 0.01$, and the expectation value for the π^0 background (B) are given.

boundaries for these bins are: 200,300,400,500, 600,800,1000,1500, and 2000 MeV. The true theory parameters were taken as $\Delta m^2 = 0.42$ eV^2, $\sin^2 2\theta = 0.01$, for which $\rho = 0.587$. The mean energy, expectation value for signal for the data set values and for background are given in Table 1. For this example the signal and background are comparable.

Confidence regions were calculated using a fake data study going over a grid of 21 points in $\sin^2 2\theta$ and 41 points in Δm^2. A double loop was made over the grid. First each point on the grid was taken in turn as the "true" point. A set of data was then calculated for that point. These events were then analyzed using the expectations for each point on the grid as the second loop. One thousand twenty four trials for each point were made. The analysis method used was the constrained fit method described in Section 2. The δ parameter described in Section 2 was normalized to have an uncertainty with $\sigma = 1$. To do that δ was multiplied by 0.15 which is the uncertainty in the background.

In an actual experiment, one uses the measured data set to compare with the results from the double loop for each of the points on the grid where the double loop includes statistical and background variations. In this test the "data" was also varied in a data loop to find a better average of results.

A convolution is needed in order to determine confidence limits. For a test T, let $P(T)$ be the probability that a worse result is obtained for a given value of T (obtained from the double loop). Let $f(T)dT$ be the differential probability of T from the data loop. The quantity required is $\int P(T)f(T)dT$. Since the trials in the data loop follow $f(T)$, this is just the sum of $P(T_i)$/number of trials. (T_i is the result for trial i).

There is a subtle point here. As noted in Section 4, the fit parameter is z = theory plus $\rho_{eff}\times$background. As noted there, the χ^2 numerator is still of the form data minus theory minus background as the sum of the correlated and uncorrelated background is the full background. However, when using correlations, the fit for δ uses only the uncorrelated part of the background. This must be transferred to the correlated part of the background. This shifts the value of $\sin^2 2\theta$ from the grid value a bit. $sin^2 2\theta \rightarrow sin^2 2\theta(1. - \delta * \rho_{eff} * .15)$.

The constrained fit method includes the background as another variable to be fit within its known limits. However, for the fake data discussion here, Bayes considerations are necessary. The constrained fit doesn't work against one background, but works against a

χ^2 plot	mean	σ	δ mean	δ σ
data nc nobkd	7.25	3.69	-0.0070	0.43
data nc bkd	8.06	4.18	0.0066	0.91
data cor nobkd	7.87	3.86	-0.008	0.40
data cor bkd	10.83	6.54	0.007	0.83
data nc nobkd 1σ	8.71	4.07	0.78	0.43
data nc bkd 1σ	9.44	4.91	0.77	0.90
data cor nobkd 1σ	11.239	5.14	0.71	0.39
data cor bkd 1σ	14.36	9.76	0.70	0.82

TABLE 2. Values for the mean and sigma at the data value and the mean and sigma of the δ parameter at the data value. Nc means no regression correlations included, cor means regression correlations have been included. Nobkd means that background expectations were not varied in the trials; only statistical variations were used. Bkd means that the trials included both statistical and background variations. 1σ means that the actual background expectation value was taken to be one sigma larger than the assumed value.

different background for each trial. Nature has chosen one value for the expected background. If the background is varied within the double loop, the limits are blurred. If the background of the "data" sample is also varied, this corresponds to the blurring occuring twice which tends to hide the difference of the non-correlated and correlated calculations. This can be seen in Table 2. The width of the δ distribution approximately doubles if background uncertainties are included in the trials. If the central background value is one sigma higher than assumed, then the δ values are strongly skewed as the constrained fit tries to correct for this. The one sigma samples are included to illustrate the effect of an incorrect background assumption, but the analysis will mostly concentrate on the samples with correct central background estimates.

Note that if regression correlations are included the value of the χ^2 is quite large at the data value if background variations are included. It was noted earlier that if no fit is made, but only the χ^2 obtained at a specific value of the theory parameters, regression correlations should not be included. If the theory values are fixed any correlation between background and theory is irrelevant. If no regression correlations are included, then for no background variation, the χ^2 at the data value is lower than the value of eight expected. Since the background errors are still included in the covariance for the fit, but not in the Monte Carlo, the results must be low. They are less low if regression correlations are included because the size of the background variance is decreased. For full correlation with no background the χ^2 would be about one unit low. Here, $\rho = 0.59$ and the difference between the χ^2 for correlated vs non-correlated fits is 0.62, as was expected.

χ^2 plot	nc mean	nc σ	cor mean	cor σ
best nobkd	6.06	3.22	6.26	3.29
best bkd	6.18	3.51	6.42	3.58
best nobkd 1σ	6.36	3.36	6.54	3.36
best bkd 1σ	6.37	3.52	6.60	3.58

TABLE 3. Values for the mean and sigma at the best value. Nc means no regression correlations included, cor means regression correlations have been included. Nobkd means that background expectations were not varied in the trials; only statistical variations were used. Bkd means that the trials included both statistical and background variations. 1σ means that the actual background expectation value was taken to be one sigma larger than the assumed value.

Table 3 presents the values of the best χ^2 found in going over the grid of values. Since the variation of background with trials adds something not found in Nature, consider the best no background values. The mean values are close to the expected value of six for a fit with two parameters, but the widths are a bit smaller than the expected χ^2 widths of 3.46. The width of the non-corrolated best χ^2 is close to the value of 3.16 expected for five degrees of freedom.

The mean values are 0.20 larger if regression correlations are included. A back-of-the-envelope calculation indicates this number is about right. The error in the background is 15%. Since the background and theory are approximately equal this is 7.5% of the total background plus theory. For $\rho = 0.59$, the difference between the background error for the non-correlated and correlated calculations is about 4%. This would give a difference of 0.24 of the expected minimum of 6. This difference is further diluted by the presence of the statistical error in the error matrix. The fact that the minima for both correlated and non-correlated χ^2 is slightly above 6 can be attributed to the fact that the minimum here is a minimum over the grid points, not the actual minimum.

An important test is to examine the size of the confidence regions. Although a fake data study will give consistent results with any unbiased test, a better test will produce a smaller confidence region. If background variations are included both in the double loop and the data loop, then the confidence regions are much larger than if they are included in only one of them. Here it has been chosen to include the background variations in the data loop, but not in the double loop. If the region is chosen by the $\Delta\chi^2$ test, that is by using $\chi^2 - \chi^2_{best}$, then if regression correlations are not included the the ratio of sizes of confidence regions for single variation to double variation is about 74% and about 54% if regression correlations are included. If just the simple χ^2 value is used as a test, then the ratios are 96% if regression correlations are not included and 77% if regression correlations are included. s noted earlier, the background variation is really a Bayesian variation. Putting the variation in the data loop makes a clean division. The data loop can be considered as

Data	Method	nc 90%	cor 90%	ratio	nc 95%	cor 95%	ratio
reg.	χ^2	54	37	0.69	69	54	0.78
reg.	Δ	27	24	0.89	46	37	0.80
1 σ	χ^2	43	33	0.77	60	40	0.67
1σ	Δ	30	27	0.90	36	34	0.94

TABLE 4. Table of the number of grid points within the confidence limits. 1σ means the background is higher than estimated by 1σ (15%). χ^2 means that the test is just the χ^2 value for the data. Δ means that the test is $\chi^2 - \chi^2_{best}$. Nc means that regression correlations were not included and cor means that they were included. Ratio is the ratio of number of grid points in the confidence region included for cor divided by the number included for nc. The double loop included only statistical variations. The "data" consisted of 5001 repetitions with both statistical and background variations.

integrating over the Bayesian prior. (This method could be followed with actual data.) The resulting confidence regions are not frequentist, but more like Bayesian credible regions. Results are shown in Table 4.

The Δ method gives the smallest confidence regions. Including regression correlations significantly lowers the size of the regions. (A test with only one-fifth the number of trials was only negligably different from the one used.)

The χ^2 are shown for the data value with and without regression correlations in Figure 2. The χ^2 plot with regression correlations has a larger tail. Figure 3 shows the χ^2 plot with and without regression correlations for the point on the grid corresponding to the best χ^2 value. The means and σ's for these plots were given in Tables 2 and 3.

Comparison of the confidence regions obtained with and without including regression correlations are shown in Figures 4-7. The 90% and 95% confidence level plots are shown in Figure 4 for the χ^2 test and Figure 5 for the Δ test. Results are shown in Figures 6 and 7 for the sample with the background 15% higher than the assumed background.



FIGURE 2. The χ^2 distribution is shown for the data values. The top plot shows the distribution if the regression correlation method is not used and the bottom plot shows the result if the regression correlations are included. Both statistical and background variations are included.



FIGURE 3. The best χ^2 obtained in going over the grid of points is shown if the data was fit using the data values. The top plot shows the distribution if the regression correlation method is not used and the bottom plot shows the result if the regression correlations are included. Both statistical and background variations are included.



FIGURE 4. Plots of Δm^2 vs $\sin^2 2\theta$ for events within 90% and 95% confidence regions using the "χ^2" method. The x-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of $\sin^2 2\theta$ and the y-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of Δm^2. The top plot shows the acceptance if the regression correlation method is not used and the bottom plot shows the result if the regression correlations are included. The black dots are within the 90% confidence region and the red stars are within the 95% region. The open green star is the best fit point and the filled green circle is the "real" data point.



FIGURE 5. Plots of Δm^2 vs $\sin^2 2\theta$ for events within 90% and 95% confidence regions using the "Δ" method. The x-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of $\sin^2 2\theta$ and the y-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of Δm^2. The top plot shows the acceptance if the regression correlation method is not used and the bottom plot shows the result if the regression correlations are included. The black dots are within the 90% confidence region and the red stars are within the 95% region. The open green star is the best fit point and the filled green circle is the "real" data point.



FIGURE 6. Plots of Δm^2 vs $\sin^2 2\theta$ for events within 90% and 95% confidence regions using the "χ^2" method. It is assumed for these plots that the background is 15% larger than expected. The x-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of $\sin^2 2\theta$ and the y-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of Δm^2. The top plot shows the acceptance if the regression correlation method is not used and the bottom plot shows the result if the regression correlations are included. The black dots are within the 90% confidence region and the red stars are within the 95% region. The open green star is the best fit point and the filled green circle is the "real" data point.



FIGURE 7. Plots of Δm^2 vs $\sin^2 2\theta$ for events within 90% and 95% confidence regions using the "Δ" method. It is assumed for these plots that the background is one σ (15%) larger than expected. The x-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of $\sin^2 2\theta$ and the y-axis is the $\log_{10}$ of Δm^2. The top plot shows the acceptance if the regression correlation method is not used and the bottom plot shows the result if the regression correlations are included. The black dots are within the 90% confidence region and the red stars are within the 95% region. The open green star is the best fit point and the filled green circle is the "real" data point.

8. Summary

Methods are given for using the χ^2 method when regression correlations between the shapes of backgrounds and theoretical models being fitted occur. These methods are appropriate whenever these correlations exist.

Fake data studies without including these correlations often will not be optimum. The use of "effective number of degrees of freedom" will help the situation, but will not be as accurate as the methodology introduced here. If regression correlations are used, the confidence regions are smaller than if they are not used.

9. Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the considerable help of Xuming-He, the H. C. Carver Professor of Statistics, University of Michigan, during several discussions which helped clarify the problem and correct several errors. Michael Shaevitz, Professor of Physics, Columbia University, Janet Conrad, Professor of Physics, MIT, MIT graduate student Christina Ignarra and LANL Staff Member William Louis read through the note and helped to find ambiguities and errors.

References

[1] D. Stump *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 014012 (2001).
[2] "Measurement of the Rate of NC pi0 Production at MiniBooNE" , Z. Djurcic *et al.*, MiniBooNE Technical Report 194, 8/8/06, revised 2/10/07.
[3] A.A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*, "First Measurement of the Muon Neutrino Charged Current Quasielastic Double Differential Cross Section", arXiv:1002:2680 [hep-ex], Phys. Rev. D81, 092005 (2010).
[4] Harald Cramer, "Mathematical Methods of Statistics, Sixth U.S. Printing, Chapter 23", Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey (1954); first published in Uppsala Sweden, Almqvist & Wiksells (1945).
[5] Byron P. Roe, "Probability and Statistics in Experimental Physics, 2nd ed., Chapter 10", Springer-Verlag, New York, Inc. (2001).
[6] Fred James and Matthias Winkler, "Minuit User's Guide", CERN, Geneva 23, Switzerland (2004).

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48105